

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—Except that Mr. B. S. Puttaswamy wrote an article, we do not know anything.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Are the Government aware that "The Visvakarnataka" wrote a leading article on the incident?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—No.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—The Member was pleased to read a certain rule. Is it a rule framed under the old Regulation or under the new Regulation?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—It was framed under the old Regulation but it is in force now also.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Will the Government be pleased to see that in future at least non-official Vice-Presidents are permitted to enjoy the privilege of being in charge of the Presidents' duties when the latter go on leave?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Yes, provided they deserve it.

Q.—10. Messrs. B. CHAMIAH (Seringapatam Taluk); K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk); GURUBASAPPA and K. C. SUBBANNA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); M. C. LINGE GOWDA and S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk); NANJIAH *alias* APPAJIAH (Hunsur Taluk); MIR RAZA ALI SAHIB and M. MADIAH (Minorities); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Special Interests); THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA (Krishnarajapet Taluk); T. MARIYAPPA (Mysore City Municipality); H. HONNAIYA (Mandya Taluk); T. S. MADAPPA and B. S. PUTTASWAMY (Nanjangud Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether the President of the City Municipal Council, Mysore, has not passed a memo delegating to the Vice-President powers of supervision over two sections, without obtaining the general or special orders of Government in the matter as required under Section 26 (1) of the City Municipalities Regulation;

(b) whether the same President had not withdrawn all the powers, namely, supervision over seven sections, delegated to the Vice-President, likewise without obtaining orders from Government and without assigning reasons;

(c) whether the Vice-President, Mr. Mohamed Sait, did not question

the legality of the action of the President in an appeal to Government, and, if so, when;

(d) whether the attention of the Government was not drawn by Mr. Mohamed Sait to the decision of the High Court in the election appeal of Mr. U. L. Ramachandra Rao, whose election was set aside on the ground that there were no rules and bye-laws framed for the purpose as required by a rule or notification of Government;

(e) what was the decision of the Government and have they assigned any reason for the same and when was the same passed?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. A. V. Ramathan).—

(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes. The petitions are dated 29th January 1936, 30th January 1936, and 14th February 1936.

(d) Yes.

(e) (i) Government could not accept Mr. Mohamed Sait's interpretation of Section 26 (1) of the City Municipalities Regulation.

(ii) On 13th March 1936.

Mr. B. CHAMIAH.—May I know the reasons why the President withdrew all the powers delegated to the Vice-President?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—I can only say that Government had very good reasons for approving of the action of the Municipal President. I can assure you that no question of policy was involved in this matter. It was only a question of using discretion.

Q.—11. Messrs. B. CHAMIAH (Seringapatam Taluk); K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk); GURUBASAPPA and K. C. SUBBANNA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); M. C. LINGE GOWDA and S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk); NANJIAH *alias* APPAJIAH (Hunsur Taluk); MIR RAZA ALI SAHIB and M. MADIAH (Minorities); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Special Interests); THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA (Krishnarajapet Taluk); T. MARIYAPPA (Mysore City Municipality); H. HONNAIYA (Mandya Taluk); T. S. MADAPPA and B. S. PUTTASWAMY (Nanjangud Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) (i) when were the house-taxes revised recently in the Nagamangala Town; (ii) who were the President and Vice-President then;

(b) (i) have the Municipal Council passed a resolution that the taxes on houses be revised; (ii) if so, when; (iii) was any committee formed to deal with this question;

(c) what are the recommendations of this committee;

(d) (i) have the Council approved of these recommendations and sanctioned them; (ii) if so, on what date and what is the resolution passed thereon;

(e) have further steps been taken in terms of this resolution;

(f) were notifications published and notices issued to the effect that taxes had been enhanced;

(g) (i) are the Government aware that the rates have now been doubled and even trebled; (ii) have any objection petitions been received from the rate-payers?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. Venkatanaranappa).—

(a) (i) In the year 1930-31.

(ii) Mr. B. Srinivasa Murthi was President and Mr. Mohamed Ghouse was Vice-President.

(b) (i) Yes.

(ii) On 2nd December 1930.

(iii) Yes.

(c) That the taxes on houses, etc., might be revised as per assessment list furnished by them.

(d) (i) Yes.

(ii) On 5th February 1931. The resolution was in favour of accepting the recommendations.

(e) Yes.

(f) Notification was published by *tom-tom*.

(g) (i) Yes, in some cases.

(ii) Yes.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Which Regulation was in force at the time of the revision of house taxes?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—The old Regulation.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Was there any dissenting minute by any member of the committee?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Notice.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—On what basis was the assessment list prepared?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Notice.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Was an assessing officer appointed at all?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Notice.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—When was the revision, given effect to in 1930-31, approved?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—On 5th February 1931.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Did the Municipal Council subsequently revise the assessment list?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—No.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Was any municipal officer or any other officer deputed to personally see the houses before confirming the revision?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—We are not aware.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—What is the wording of the resolution appointing the assessment revision committee?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Notice.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Under what section of the Municipal Regulation have the Municipal Council acted?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—It would be better to discuss all that in the Municipal Council itself.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Were any objection petitions sent to Government?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Yes. And Government perused the records and thought that there was no reason for them to interfere.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Was the revision published in the official gazette?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—No. But the *isthihar* was published locally.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—How was the publication arranged for?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—By *tom-tom*.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Is there a copy of the *isthihar* in the records?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Some of the records are stated to be missing.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—If so, should not the entire question be referred to the Council for reconsideration?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—There was a long interval between approving of the revision and giving effect to it. Meanwhile, the term of the Council which revised the assessments expired and it was succeeded by another Council. So also the previous Vice-President's term expired and it was his successor who gave effect to the revised assessments. And that gentleman is now dead. I do not think any useful purpose will be served by going into the question any further.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—When house-taxes were raised, the people represented that such increase would hit them very hard and so the resolution of the Municipality was not given effect to at first. A new Vice-President came to power and he gave effect to it. The assessment has been trebled and quadrupled in some cases. Objection petitions were not called for. Appeals to higher officers had no effect. In view of all that, may we not request the Government to refer back the entire question to the Municipal Council and obviate all difficulties?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Already three years have elapsed. The next revision will soon fall due when all the difficulties may be represented and proper relief obtained.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—But even now, houses are being auctioned on account of non-payment of assessment as revised. So some immediate relief is necessary. The Deputy Commissioner and the Revenue Commissioner have summarily rejected appeals from individual parties. If we represent to the Municipal Council that the question be reconsidered, they say they cannot do it. Between those, what should be the fate of the poor house-owners?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—If the Municipal Council also have refused to interfere, they must have done so for very good reasons. If the Council do not wish to reduce the assessment, others can do nothing in the matter.

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET—(contd.).

Mr. T. MADIHAH GOWDA felicitated the Government on definitely stating that in the budget-year they would be going to have a surplus of Rs. 2 lakhs, a feature which had not been witnessed for the past 10 years. In six out of the past 10 years there had been heavy deficits aggregating Rs. 140 lakhs in addition to withdrawals to the extent of Rs. 68 lakhs from reserve funds. So, the mere expectation of a surplus of Rs. 2 lakhs was an encouraging feature. But, it remained to be seen whether the year would really result in a surplus balance. So far as he could judge, he was afraid there would be no surplus. In 1934-35 the percentage of land revenue collections to the total demand was 77.93. And for the year 1935-36, against the estimate of 83.69 per cent the revised was only 82.60 per cent. The actuals for that year were not yet ready. For the budget year, under land revenue it was estimated that the percentage of collections would be 82.87. He did not know how far that anticipation would prove correct. The percentage of collection was the lowest in 1934-35 and he did not know how the Government expected improvement during the current and budget years. Seasonal conditions had not improved, the same state of affairs as existed in 1934-35 still continued, and the agriculturists were still faced with unprecedented economic depression. Agriculturists as a class were heavily indebted, their inability to discharge debts continued as before, and their creditors were dragging them to court. They were unable to replace the cattle that died on account of dearth of fodder and water. On this account they were unable even to carry on their agricultural avocations. The very fact that Government had to bring forward the Debt Conciliation Bill showed that the agriculturists stood in need of special relief. So far as the current year was concerned, the *mungar* rains had so far failed and the prospect for the future was anything but bright. So, it could not be said with certainty